

SECTION M EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 BASIS FOR AWARD

M.1.1 AWARD SELECTION: The Offeror whose offer conforms to the requirements of the solicitation and provides the best value to the FAA will be selected for award. The best value is defined as the proposal that presents the most advantageous solution to the FAA, based on the evaluation of technical, price and other factors specified in the SIR. The best value approach provides the opportunity for technical cost/price trade-offs and does not require that award be made to either the Offeror submitting the highest rated proposal or the Offeror submitting the lowest price, although the ultimate award may be to either one of those Offerors.

Each offer will be evaluated separately, and in evaluating the proposals, the Government may conduct written or oral communications with any and/or all Offerors, and may reduce the firms participating in the competition to only those Offerors most likely to receive award. Additionally, the FAA reserves the right to conduct discussions and negotiations with any individual competing Offeror, or all competing Offerors, as the situation warrants. Discussions with one or more Offeror does not require discussions with all Offerors.

If, at any point during the evaluation of proposals, the FAA concludes based on information submitted by an Offeror orally or in writing, that the Offeror does not have a reasonable chance of receiving an award, then that Offeror may be rendered no longer eligible for award and eliminated from further consideration. Any Offeror eliminated from further consideration will be officially notified in writing.

The FAA reserves the right not to make an award if such action is in its best interest.

Offerors are cautioned not to minimize the importance of a detailed adequate response in any one of the factors due to its not being numerically scored.

M.1.2 ORDER OF IMPORTANCE: The basis for award will be made against the evaluation factors contained in section M and the FAA's assessment of the risk involved in making an award to an Offeror. All factors will be considered in the evaluation for award. The following evaluation factors are listed in descending order of importance. Technical is the most important factor, followed by Business/Management Approach factor, followed by Past Performance factor, followed by Price. The Technical and Business Management Approach will be numerically scored. Past Performance will be evaluated as either acceptable or unacceptable. Price will be evaluated for completeness, reasonableness and realism and will not be scored. As technical differences between offers become smaller, the price becomes more important.

M.1.3 ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARD: To be eligible for award, the Offeror must meet the all the requirements of the SIR. However, the FAA reserves the right to reject any and all offers, waive any requirements, minor irregularities and discrepancies, if it would be in the best interest of the FAA to do so. The Offeror must also be determined to be financially viable and otherwise responsible.

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1.4 AWARD ON INITIAL OFFERS: The FAA reserves the right to award a contract immediately following the conclusion of any evaluation, and may not require discussions or negotiations with the successful Offeror or any other Offeror. Therefore, it is critical that each offer be fully responsive to this SIR and its provisions. All submittals in response to a SIR should contain the Offeror's best terms from a price, technical, and business and management standpoint. If the FAA awards on initial offers, the basis for award remains best value and, therefore, the successful Offeror may not have submitted the lowest price.

M.2 EVALUATION PROCESS

M.2.1 During the evaluation process, the Government Evaluation Team (comprised of a Contracting Officer, Technical Evaluation Team and a Price Evaluation Team) will evaluate each Offeror's proposals using information submitted by the Offeror (or in the case of past performance, obtained from outside references and other points of contact) against evaluation factors contained in Section M.3.

M.2.2 During the evaluation, the Technical Evaluation Team will evaluate the Offeror's technical proposal and the business/management proposals against evaluation factors in Sections M.3 and M.4.

M.2.3 Past performance analysis will be conducted by the Contracting Officer in accordance with procedures in Section M.4.4.

M.2.4 A separate Price Evaluation team will also evaluate the Offeror's Price Proposals against the criteria addressed in Section M.4.5.

M.2.5 Risk will be assessed throughout the evaluation process. Risk assessment is the Government's estimates as to the Offeror's ability to perform successfully in light of the Government's evaluation of the Offeror's proposal. Risk assessment will be conducted in accordance with Section M.5.

M.2.6 Federal Aviation Administration's Small Business Office will evaluate the subcontracting plan in accordance with Section M.4.1

M.2.7 The Government evaluation team will then compile the results from all evaluation criteria and present their findings to the Source Selection Official (SSO), who will select the offer providing the best value to the FAA. This will be based on the Technical proposal, Business/Management Proposal, Past Performance, Price Proposal and risk characterization as determined by the SSO.

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.3 EVALUATION FACTORS:

The following Four (4) evaluation factors will be used in evaluating the Offerors proposals. The evaluation factors and subfactors are listed in descending order of importance. Factor 1 and its subfactors will be used to evaluate the sample tasks. The sample tasks of equal importance.

FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL APPROACH -Corporate Relevant Knowledge

SUBFACTOR – 1.1 - Knowledge of methodology for conducting Operational System Analysis (OSA), Comparative System Analysis (CSA), Preliminary Hazard Analysis (PHA), System Hazard Analysis (SHA), Sub-System Hazard Analysis (SSHA), and Operating and Support Hazard Analysis (O&SHA) analysis in accordance with the Safety Management System (SMS) requirements, Safety Risk Management Guidance for System Acquisitions (SRMGSA, System Safety Assessment Report (SSAR), Hazard Tracking and Risk Resolution (HTRR), Non-Punitive Voluntary Confidential Safety Reporting System, and Safety Culture including Safety Culture Survey Analysis, Safety Climate Assessment, and Safety Culture Workshops.

SUBFACTOR – 1.2 - In-depth working knowledge of the FAA's National Airspace System (NAS) including air traffic procedures of the various airspace domains, including, tower, terminal, en route, oceanic, and airports. (Note: this knowledge is necessary in order to properly assess air traffic waivers, airspace changes, and new procedures and separations standards for impact to safety as it applies to the system being changed as well as for the potential impact to interfacing systems).

SUBFACTOR – 1.3 - In-depth working knowledge of the FAA's National Airspace System (NAS) including its constituent parts, their interdependencies and their interconnectivity of the various airspace domains, including, tower, terminal, en route, oceanic, and airports. (Note: this knowledge is necessary in order to properly assess NAS Change Proposals (NCP's) for impact to safety as it applies to the system being changed as well as for the potential impact to interfacing systems).

SUBFACTOR – 1.4 - Working knowledge of FAA Orders, Federal Aviation Regulations, Advisory Circulars, applicable laws, regulations (e.g., Code of Federal Regulations), ICAO requirements pertinent to the implementation and maintenance of Safety Management System (SMS) and other documentation as it applies to control and mitigation of aviation related hazards.

SUBFACTOR 1.5 – Detailed knowledge of AMS policy and the FAA Acquisition Toolset.

SECTION M EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

FACTOR 2 - BUSINESS/MANAGEMENT APPROACH

SUBFACTOR 2.1 - Resumes

SUBFACTOR 2.2- Quality Control Plan

FACTOR 3 - PAST PERFORMANCE

FACTOR 4 - PRICE

M.4 EVALUATIONS

The Offeror's proposals will be evaluated based upon their written proposal and any discussions. Each of the evaluations factors and subfactors will be evaluated based on the Offeror's proposed approach, and understanding. (**Approach** – The degree to which the technical approach demonstrates comprehension of the requirements and the necessary resources to implement a successful program. **Understanding** – The degree to which the technical approach for implementing the requirements is logical, feasible, and achievable given the requirements. The degree that the technical performance and schedule risks are identified and mitigated).

M.4.1 VOLUME I, Section E, Subcontracting Plan, if applicable.

The Subcontracting plan will be evaluated based upon the Offer's demonstrated commitment to assuring that small business concerns are provided maximum opportunity to participate in this effort. The evaluation will consider the plausibility that the established subcontracting goals can be achieved. The Subcontracting Plan will be evaluated by the FAA Small Business Office and deemed acceptable or unacceptable.

M.4.2 FACTOR 1 - Technical Approach Evaluation

The government team will use Factor 1 and its subfactors in evaluating each of the four sample tasks provided in Section L.15.1 of the SIR. The sample tasks are of equal importance. The team will assess the degree to which the offerors' approach demonstrates the knowledge and ability to perform what is required for Factor 1 and its subfactors.

M.4.3 FACTOR 2 – Business and Management Evaluation

Subfactor 2.1 Resumes - The Government team will evaluate the Offerors approach in acquiring Key Personnel that have the education, knowledge and experience to meet the minimum requirements in Section H and program objectives.

The following are designated Key Personnel:

- Program Manager
- Safety Management Specialist
- Safety Engineer
- Air Traffic Control Specialist

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Subfactor 2.2 Quality Control Plan - The Government team will assess the degree to which the Offeror's approach describes how to establish and maintain full compliance with all requirements of this contract. The Government will assess the degree to which the Offeror's approach demonstrates how the Offeror plans to ensure that the required number of resources will be applied to the effort, without waste; and how billable hours of all labor categories will be generated, validated, and certified by the Offeror to ensure that valid invoices are submitted for payment. In addition, the Government will assess the degree to which the Offeror's approach describes its quality performance methodology that is applicable to the specific requirements to be performed, to include how the highest quality of services will be furnished; how the plan was developed; how it will be implemented; and how it will be maintained over the life of the contract.

M.4.4 Factor 3- Past Performance Evaluation

Past performance will be evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. Offerors are to note that in conducting the Past Performance evaluation, the FAA will use both data provided by the Offeror and data obtained from other Government sources. The following definitions apply:

Acceptable – The Offeror's product or service satisfies the government Minimum requirements as specified in the SIR. Few weaknesses exist which are likely to affect overall program schedule, product quality or performance.

Unacceptable – The Offeror's product or service does not meet the minimum requirements as specified in the SIR. Expected program schedules, product or performance are likely to be impacted by the Offerors' proposed solution.

Successful past performance will be evaluated based upon input received from individuals and organizations familiar with as to whether or not the offeror has a track record of quality work, timeliness of performance, satisfied customers, and demonstrated price and schedule control procedures on efforts that are similar in size, scope and complexity to this SIR. The questionnaires received will be used to determine successful past performance. If past performance is unacceptable, the Offer will be notified of ineligibility for award.

M.4.5 Factor 4 Price Proposal Evaluation

The total evaluated base period and four options years for each area will be considered in making award decision. **Price will not be scored in the evaluation of proposals.** The price proposal will be assessed to the completeness, reasonableness and realism of each Offer's response, the confidence level in the Offeror's ability to provide resources to the proposed prices and whether the pricing methodology appears to be well developed and substantiated. A definition for completeness, reasonableness and realism are as follows:

Completeness: Responsiveness in providing all SIR requirements. Review of the proposal to ensure data provided is sufficient to allow for complete analysis and evaluation of the prices delineated in Section B and includes all the information and exhibits required by Section L.

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Reasonableness: As assessment as to whether the propose price does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person in performing the required effort. Prices that are unreasonably low and/or do not realistically consider market condition, inflation, deflation and general economic conditions will not be considered for award.

Realism: An assessment of the level of confidence and reliability placed in the Offeror's proposed price elements and whether they produce a realistic proposed price based upon Government requirements and the Offeror's proposed technical approach. Therefore, the price evaluation will also determine additional inherent cost uncertainties within each Offer's proposal. The price evaluation team will identify variables and/or discrepancies within an Offeror's proposal.

M.5 RISK ANALYSIS

M.5.1 Risk assessment analysis serves to assess and evaluate potential risks to the Government associated with the selection of each Offeror's overall proposal for fulfilling the requirements of the SIR. Risk is defined as the Government's degree of confidence that the Offeror will successfully meet performance baseline implicitly or explicitly incorporated into the proposal, that the solutions proposed will successfully meet the requirements of the SIR, and that the benefits in relation to the subfactors will be realized. Risk will be adjectivally rated as low, moderate, or high. The primary criteria to be used in the assessment of risk will be the degree to which the Offeror substantiates the ability to meet schedule, price and performance components of the SIR. The evaluation of risk will also focus on whether each proposal volume supports and is logically consistent with information supplied in other volumes. It will also examine any unsubstantiated representations made in any proposal volume.

M.5.2 Risk will be assessed throughout the evaluation. Risk elements assessed may not be assigned equal importance in determining the overall degree of risk to the Government inherent in each Offeror's proposal. Therefore, a single unmitigated risk item may pose such a high degree of uncertainty as to cause the entire proposal to be determined as high risk to the Government. Based on this risk assessment evaluation, an overall adjectival rating describing the risk inherent to each offeror's proposal will be assigned. Risk will be adjectivally rated as follows:

HIGH (H). Likely to cause serious disruptions of schedule, increases in cost or degradation of performance even with special emphasis and close monitoring

MODERATE (M). Can potentially cause some disruption of schedule, increases in cost, or degradation of performance, but with special emphasis and close monitoring of the contractor, will probably be able to overcome difficulties.

LOW (L). Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increases in cost, or degradation of performance. With normal effort/monitoring will probably overcome difficulties.

M.6 RESPONSIBILITY

An offeror must be determined responsible to be eligible for award. The Government may conduct a Pre-Award Survey at its discretion. The Government reserves the right to conduct a Pre-Award Survey on any subcontractor. To be eligible for award, the contractor must be technically and financially capable of performing the work.

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.7 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS AMS 3.2.4-31 (April 1996)

Except when it is determined not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).